

REMARKS

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on 17 July 2006 for the above-referenced patent application.

In the present Amendment, the Applicant amends claim 1; no claims have been canceled and no new claims have been added. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendment of claim 1. The Applicants hereby respectfully request entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the claims as amended.

In the Office Action mailed on 17 July 2006, the Examiner confirmed the restriction requirement associated with Group I claims 1-13 (method of making a read head) and Group II claims 14-21 (method of forming a read sensor for a magnetic head). In response, the Applicant continues to disagree with the restriction requirement for reasons already stated.

In addition, withdrawn independent claim 14 has limitations of substantially the same scope as (but narrower than) elected and allowed claim 22. See the Table below for comparison.

Claim 22 (Elected/Allowed)	Claim 14 (Withdrawn)
22. (Original) A method for use in making a read head, comprising:	14. (Withdrawn) A method of for use in making a magnetic read head, comprising:
forming a read sensor which is abutted by longitudinal bias layers;	forming a plurality of read sensor layers over a wafer; forming a photoresist over the read sensor layers in a central region; with the photoresist in place: ion milling so that read sensor layers in side regions are removed to thereby form the read sensor only in the central region; depositing the longitudinal

	layers in the side regions; depositing a silicon layer over the longitudinal bias layers in the side regions; removing the photoresist; and
selectively depositing lead layers over the longitudinal bias layers with use of a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process, the silicon reduction process comprising the further acts of:	selectively depositing lead layers over the longitudinal bias layers with use of a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process, the silicon reduction process comprising the further acts of:
depositing a silicon reactant layer over the longitudinal bias layers; and	depositing a silicon layer over the longitudinal bias layers in the side regions;
passing a carrier gas which includes lead layer material so that the carrier gas is chemically reduced by the silicon.	passing a carrier gas which includes lead layer material so that the carrier gas is chemically reduced by the silicon.

As apparent, limitations of elected and allowed claim 22 and withdrawn claim 14 are substantially the same in many respects. It makes no sense to maintain the restriction of claims 14-21. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the requirement for restriction and include claims 14-21 in the present application, and to further allow claims 14-21 as being further limiting than allowed claim 22.

In the Office Action mailed 17 July 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,623) in view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,617,265) and further in view of Nachtman (U.S. Patent No. 3,152,886). Also in the Office Action, the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter in claims 5-13 and 22-33.

In response, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 5-13 and claims 22-33 and submit that the invention as defined by such claims should be broadly protected as warranted by law.

On the other hand, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the continued rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For one, the cited references in

combination fail to teach or suggest the step of “*depositing lead layers selectively over the longitudinal bias layers, without depositing lead layers over a trackwidth region of the read sensor, with use of a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process.*”

In Lin, lead layers are deposited in full film over longitudinal bias layers and over the trackwidth region of the read sensor; there is no selective deposition of materials. See e.g. FIGs. 5, especially FIG. 5a of the Lin reference. Thus, the Lin reference is no longer relevant for rejection. Further in Nachtman, techniques for reduction of metals are discussed but no teachings of selective deposition over particular locations of a read sensor structure are disclosed. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of the “selective deposition” step as recited to construct that which is claimed.

Since the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations and render the invention obvious, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw all rejections of claims and allow the present application.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 22 and 28 as being substantial duplicates of claims 5 and 9. In response, the Applicant have amended claim 1 so that dependent claims 5 and 9 are no longer substantial duplicates of claim 22 and 28.

The Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and reconsideration of all pending claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if necessary to expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

Date: 10 Oct 2006

*JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ.
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 6061 USA1
Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850*